



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,054	07/08/2003	John Manos	119166.001031 (50-03-002)	7996
38851	7590	03/21/2008	EXAMINER	
Stephen R. Loe			KARMELEK, ALISON L	
Law Office of Stephen R. Loe			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 649			3623	
Frisco, TX 75034				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/21/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

loe@friscopatents.com
laura.zavala@eds.com
cdsipcorrespondence@eds.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/615,054	Applicant(s) MANOS, JOHN
	Examiner ALISON KARMELEK	Art Unit 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06062005
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final, first office action upon examination of application number 10/615,054. Claims 1-37 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 14 of claim 34 recites, "alerting the held desk". Examiner is assuming this limitation is alerting the help desk... Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (US 6,219,648).
5. As per claim 1, Jones et al. teaches a method for monitoring service tickets for information technology service providers to ensure that levels of service to a customer are met, the method comprising: inspecting a service ticket in a database to determine a deadline for when a problem associated with the

Art Unit: 3623

service ticket must be resolved (col. 3, lines 11-20; col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 2; col. 6, line 35-col. 7, line 61; col. 8, line 55-col. 10, line 64 teaches time intervals corresponding to escalation levels for a trouble ticket; the escalation levels being defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals; a ticket reporting and tracking system for inputting trouble tickets and keeping track of the ticket status in the repair process, where the information contained in the trouble report is stored in the ticket reporting and tracking system, data files are formatted into data records and send to a managing module, where the records are stored in memory and then evaluated against a configuration data file to determine if an alert should be transmitted);

determining a deadline approaching alert time at which a help desk user must be notified that the deadline for resolving the problem must be met (col. 3, lines 11-20; col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 2; col. 6, line 35-col. 7, line 61 teaches time intervals corresponding to escalation levels for a trouble ticket; the escalation levels being defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals); and

alerting the help desk user that the deadline for resolving the problem is approaching when the deadline approaching alert time is reached (col. 11, line 13-col. 12, line 30 teaches when the alerting criteria for a ticket is satisfied, then notification should be sent to the appropriate management or personnel).

6. As per claim 12, it recites a computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for performing the methods of claim 1. Since Jones et al. teaches a computer program product in a

Art Unit: 3623

computer readable media for use in a data processing system (col. 6, lines 5-35),
claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claim 1.

7. As per claim 23, it recites a system in a computer readable media for use
in a data processing system for performing the methods of claim 1. Since Jones
et al. teaches a system in a computer readable media for use in a data
processing system (col. 6, lines 5-35), claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons
set forth above in claim 1.

8. As per claim 34, Jones et al. teaches a system for monitoring service
tickets in order to provide reminders to a help desk user of impending times for
actions, comprising: a monitoring server; a database; and a help desk client (col.
6, line 5-col. 8, line 32 teach a tracking system, or a monitoring server, storing
the trouble tickets in data records, or a database; and col. 11, lines 35-54 teach
alerting going to the appropriate personnel, or a help desk client);

the database stores tickets and information regarding ticket types, ticket
severities and times for actions to be performed for each of the ticket types and
ticket severities (col. 11, lines 35-66 teach the report information containing
information including type of service required, or ticket type, ticket duration,
status, position, escalation levels, or time for actions to be performed for each
ticket, which includes ticket type; col. 15, lines 35-44 teach that the severity of
repair work can be indicated in the report as well);

the monitoring server monitors tickets in the database, determines when
time for actions are approaching, and sends alerts to the help desk client alerting
the help desk user that a time to take a specified action is approaching (col. 3,

Art Unit: 3623

lines 11-20; col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 2; col. 6, line 35-col. 7, line 61 teaches time intervals corresponding to escalation levels for a trouble ticket; the escalation levels being defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals; col. 11, line 13-col. 12, line 30 teaches when the alerting criteria for a ticket is satisfied, then notification should be sent to the appropriate management or personnel);

the help desk client displays active tickets to a help desk user and provides alerts received from the monitoring server to the help desk user (col. 5, line 50-60 teaches displaying notifications including trouble ticket number, an escalation level, date and time, service type, status, etc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Riley et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0123983 A1).

As per claim 2, Jones et al. teaches determining a status update interval for the service ticket (col. 7, lines 19-39 teaches the application receiving reports on a time interval); and

Art Unit: 3623

responsive to a determination that the problem has not been resolved by the deadline, determining a first status update alert time to alert the help desk user (vol. 7, lines 19-61 teach that the interval should be predefined and publicly known because a configuration data file for alerting contains time periods for alerting based upon this interval where once the time duration of other alerting criteria has been satisfied, the module requests an alert to be sent to the appropriate personnel).

However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach alerting the help desk user to then send a status update to the customer. Riley et al. teaches alerting the help desk user to send a status update to the customer (paragraphs 136-137 teach the exceeding a target time and sending a notification to a personnel who will be assign the problem, where paragraph 144 teaches that as service requests are escalated, or as they exceed target time and are assigned a higher tier operator in which notifications are sent to the new personnel, the Service Desk, or the personnel, needs to communicate the status with the customer).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to send a status update to the customer in response to ticket escalation as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Art Unit: 3623

10. As per claim 3, Jones et al. teaches alerting the help desk user as recited above in claim 1. However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach alerting the help desk user that a status update is approaching when the first status update alert time occurs. Riley et al. teaches alerting the help desk user that a status update is approaching when the first status update alert time occurs (paragraph 144).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to send an alert that a status update is necessary as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

11. As per claim 4, Jones et al. teaches responsive to a determination that the problem has not been resolved after a time has passed, determining a time to alert the help desk user as recited above in claim 1. However, Jones et al. does not teach the time being a status update time or , determining a time to alert the help desk user that a time to provide a new status update to the customer is approaching and alerting the help desk user prior to the time to provide the new status update.

Riley et al. teaches time being a status update time and determining a time to alert the help desk user that a time to provide a new status update to the customer is approaching and alerting the help desk user prior to the time to

Art Unit: 3623

provide the new status update (paragraphs 77-82 teach reminding personnel when to escalate incidents, when to provide status information to users, and when service levels are not being met; Fig 12 teaches notifying or alerting of escalation and contacting the customer as part of the whole service request escalation process, or rather alerting of escalation, which includes a new status update).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to alert of a status update time and providing new status updates to the customer as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

12. As per claim 5, Jones et al. teaches alerting the helpdesk user that the deadline for resolving the problem is approaching when the deadline approaching alert time is reached comprising sending an alert wherein the alert includes an identity of the service ticket (col. 11, line 35-col. 12, line 11 teach the alert message or notification including the ticket number). However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach the alert including the deadline for when a problem associate with the service ticket must be resolved.

Riley et al. teaches an alert including the deadline for when a problem associated with the service ticket must be resolved (paragraph 79 teaches

Art Unit: 3623

reminding personnel when to escalate incidents and when service levels are not being met; paragraph 143 teaches as soon as a problem cannot be resolved in the targeted service levels is will be escalated, service requests are escalated if SLAs are likely to be impacted, where the escalation should be configured to occur well before the actual SLA targets are passed, escalation includes the notification of the assignee and the next level of management, Fig. 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to include the deadline as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

13. As per claim 6, Jones et al. teaches an alert as recited above in claim 1 and further the alert being in a window (col. 2, lines 15-33). However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach the alert comprises a pop-up window. Riley et al. teaches an alert comprising a pop-up window (paragraph 137).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. a pop-up window as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately,

Art Unit: 3623

and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

14. As per claim 7, Jones et al. teaches an alert to the help desk user's data processing system as recited in claim 1. Further Riley et al. teaches the alert being a pop-up window as recited above in claim 6. However, neither Jones et al. nor Riley et al. expressly teach the pop-up window is displayed on top of all other windows that are open on the data processing system. Examiner takes Official notice that a pop-up window being displayed on top of all other windows that are open on a data processing system is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the pop-up window being displayed on top of all other windows in order to more efficiently generate a notification to alert personnel or management that outages exist that have exceeded predefined time limits of intervals (see Jones et al., col. 1, line 65-col. 2, line 2).

15. As per claim 8, Jones et al. teaches the alert comprises an audio alert (col. 2, lines 15-33 teaches the alerts being page notifications, which are audio alerts).

16. As per claim 9, Jones et al. teaches the alert comprises a graphical alert (col. 2, lines 15-33 teach the alerts being alphanumeric, e-mail, an X-window terminal message, or graphical alerts).

17. As per claim 10, Jones et al. teaches a deadline for when a problem associated with the service ticket must be resolved as recited in claim 1. However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach the deadline for when a problem

Art Unit: 3623

associated with the service ticket must be resolved is determined by consulting a ticket severity table.

Riley et al. teaches teach the deadline for when a problem associated with the service ticket must be resolved is determined by consulting a ticket severity table (paragraphs 116-123).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to determine a deadline by consulting a ticket severity table as taught by Riley et al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

18. As per claim 11, Jones et al. does not teach the ticket severity table is populated in accordance with a level of service agreement between the customer and the information technology provider.

Riley et al. teaches the ticket severity table is populated in accordance with a level of service agreement between the customer and the information technology provider (paragraphs 116-123; 61; 81).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the method monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets of Jones et al. the ability to determine a deadline by consulting a ticket severity table populated in accordance with a level of service agreement as taught by Riley et

Art Unit: 3623

al. since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well known elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

19. As per claims 13-22, they recite a computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for performing the methods of claims 2-11. Since Jones et al. teaches a computer program product in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system (col. 6, lines 5-35), claims 13-22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 2-11.

20. As per claims 24-33, they recite a system in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system for performing the methods of claims 2-11. Since Jones et al. teaches a system in a computer readable media for use in a data processing system (col. 6, lines 5-35), claims 24-33 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 2-11.

21. As per claims 36-37, they recite the system of claim 34 including limitations substantially similar to claims 9 and 8, respectively. Since Jones et al. teaches the system of claim 34 as recited above. Claims 36-37 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above in claims 9 and 8.

22. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al.

23. As per claim 35, Jones et al. teaches a time associated with the system (col. 5, line 50-col. 6, line 34). However, Jones et al. does not expressly teach

Art Unit: 3623

the time determined using a centralized clock. Examiner takes Official notice that utilizing a centralized clock when time is recorded in a computer system is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a centralized clock in order to record the time as taught by Jones et al. in order to more accurately record the time.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALISON KARMELEK whose telephone number is (571)272-1808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AK
3/11/08
/A. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Romain Jeanty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623